## Missouri Attorney General's Opinions - 2013

Opinion	Date	Topic	Summary
1-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich amending Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 5 (14-014).
2-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich amending Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 6 (14-015).
3-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich amending Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 7 (14-016).
4-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich amending Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 8 (14-017).
5-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Maureen Dickmann amending Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (14-018).
6-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 5 (2014-014).
7-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 6 (2014-015).
8-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 7 (2014-016).
9-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 8

			(2014-017).
10-2013	Jan 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Maureen Dickmann regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (2014-018).
11-2013	Jan 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Judy Bell to amend Chapters 115 and 561, Revised Statutes of Missouri (2014-020).
12-2013	Feb 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-022).
13-2013	Mar 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-023).
14-2013	Mar 14	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-022).
15-2013	Mar 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-022).
16-2013	Mar 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-024).
17-2013	Apr 8	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (2014-025).
18-2013	Apr 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-026).
19-2013	Apr 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (14-024).
20-2013	Apr 17	CIRCUIT CLERKS. CIRCUIT COURT - CIRCUIT COURTS. COURTS.	The exemption for municipal courts from the \$3 surcharge in §57.955, RSMo, was removed in 1996. Therefore, municipal court clerks must collect the surcharge in municipal ordinance violation cases.

Apr 22 Apr 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery to amend Article III of the
Apr 22		Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-027).
	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (2014-028).
Apr 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-024).
Apr 29	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (14-026).
May 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (2014-029).
May 3	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-030).
May 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-0026).
May 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-027).
May 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-032).
May 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-033).
1	Apr 29 May 2 May 3 May 6 May 10	Apr 22 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.  Apr 29 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.  May 2 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.  May 3 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.  May 6 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.  May 10 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.  May 16 INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.

31-2013	May 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Clarence L. Stanton (2014-034).
32-2013	May 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara, version 2 (2014-035).
33-2013	May 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-030).
34-2013	May 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2013-030).
35-2013	May 30	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara to amend Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 3 (2014-036).
36-2013	June 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-032).
37-2013	June 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones amending Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (14-033).
38-2013	June 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-032).
39-2013	June 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones regarding a proposed amendment to Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-033).
40-2013	June 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-037).
41-2013	June 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (2014-038).
42-2013	June 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara amending Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 3 (14-036).
43-2013	June	JOINT RESOLUTIONS.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a proposed fiscal

	20		note summary prepared for House Joint Resolution Nos. 11 & 7 amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution relating to the right to farm (14-HJR 11 & 7).
44-2013	June 20	JOINT RESOLUTIONS.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a proposed fiscal note summary prepared for House Joint Resolution No. 16 amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution relating to the admissibility of evidence (14-HJR 16).
45-2013	June 21	JOINT RESOLUTIONS. FAIR BALLOT LANGUAGE.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of the proposed fair ballot language prepared for House Joint Resolution Nos. 11 & 7 amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution relating to the right to farm.
46-2013	June 21	JOINT RESOLUTIONS. FAIR BALLOT LANGUAGE.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of the proposed fair ballot language prepared for House Joint Resolution No. 16 amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution relating to the admissibility of evidence.
47-2013	June 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 3 (2014-036).
48-2013	June 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (14-037).
49-2013	June 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (14-038).
50-2013	July 1	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed amendment to Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-037).
51-2013	July 1	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (2014-038).
52-2013	July 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara to amend Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 4 (2014-039).
53-2013	July 12	INITIATIVE PETITION.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative

		INITIATIVES.	petition submitted by Jewell Patek to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-040).
54-2013	July 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (2014-041).
55-2013	July 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (2014-042).
56-2013	July 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara amending Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 4 (14-039).
57-2013	July 26	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theo Brown (2014-043).
58-2013	July 29	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 4 (2014-039).
59-2013	Aug 1	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (14-040).
60-2013	Aug 1	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (14-041).
61-2013	Aug 1	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery amending Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (14-042).
62-2013	Aug 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-040).
63-2013	Aug 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (2014-041).
64-2013	Aug 5	INITIATIVE PETITION.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the

		INITIATIVES.	initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed amendment to Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (2014-042).
65-2013	Aug 26	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Barbara Swanson to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-045).
66-2013	Sept 3	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown (2014-046).
67-2013	Sept 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by John Elliott to amend Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-047).
68-2013	Sept 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by John Elliott to amend Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-048).
69-2013	Sept 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Brian Leuthauser (2014-049).
70-2013	Sept 9	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Barbara Swanson amending Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (14-045).
71-2013	Sept 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Barbara Swanson regarding a proposed amendment to Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-045).
72-2013	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by John Elliott amending Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (14-047).
73-2013	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by John Elliott amending Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-048).
74-2013	Sept 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Rodney Gray to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (2014-050).
75-2013	Sept 30	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by John Elliott regarding a proposed amendment to Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-047).
76-2013	Sept 30	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by John Elliott regarding a proposed amendment to Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-

			048).
77-2013	Oct 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher to amend Chapters 172, 174, 175, and 178, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (2014-051).
79-2013	Oct 21	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Rodney Gray to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-052).
80-2013	Oct 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher amending Chapters 172, 174, 175, and 178, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (14-051).
81-2013	Oct 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 172, 174, 175, and 178, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (2014-051).
82-2013	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition (2014-053).
83-2013	Nov 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (2014-054).
84-2013	Nov 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Rodney Gray amending Article IV of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-052).
85-2013	Nov 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Rodney Gray regarding a proposed amendment to Article IV of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-052).
86-2013	Nov 14	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-055).
87-2013	Nov 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-056).
88-2013	Nov 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-057).
89-2013	Nov 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron to amend Article VIII of the

			Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-058).
90-2013	Nov 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-059).
91-2013	Nov 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-060).
92-2013	Nov 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (2014-061).
93-2013	Nov 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (14-054).
94-2013	Nov 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (2014-062).
95-2013	Nov 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (2014-063).
96-2013	Nov 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (2014-064).
97-2013	Dec 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (2014-065).
98-2013	Dec 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (2014-066).
99-2013	Dec 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (2014-067).
100-2013	Dec 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (2014-054).
101-2013	Dec 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-055).

102-2013	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (14-059).
103-2013	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (14-060).
104-2013	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-055).
105-2013	Dec 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-059).
106-2013	Dec 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-060).
107-2013	Dec 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (2014-078).
108-2013	Dec 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (14-061).
109-2013	Dec 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed amending Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (14-063).
110-2013	Dec 19	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (14-065).
111-2013	Dec 19	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (14-066).
112-2013	Dec 19	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (14-067).

113-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-079).
114-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (2014-061).
115-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed regarding a proposed amendment to Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (2014-063).
116-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (2014-065).
117-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (2014-066).
118-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (2014-067).
119-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 11 (2014-080).
120-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 12 (2014-081).
121-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 13 (2014-082).
122-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 14 (2014-083).
123-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 15 (2014-084).
124-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri

			Constitution, version 16 (2014-085).
125-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 17 (2014-086).
126-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 18 (2014-087).
127-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 19 (2014-088).
128-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 20 (2014-089).
129-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 21 (2014-090).
130-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 22 (2014-091).
131-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 23 (2014-092).
132-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 24 (2014-093).
133-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 25 (2014-094).
134-2013	Dec 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 26 (2014-095).
135-2013	Dec 30	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (14-032).



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 1-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 31, 2012, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich, version 5 (14-014). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Increased state and local government costs for wages, operating expenses, and programs could exceed an estimated \$60 million annually. State and local government income and sales tax revenue could increase by an estimated \$8.8 million annually.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 2-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 31, 2012, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich, version 6 (14-015). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Increased state and local government costs for wages, operating expenses, and programs could exceed an estimated \$63 million annually. State and local government income and sales tax revenue could increase by an estimated \$9.9 million annually.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

\_

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 3-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 31, 2012, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich, version 7 (14-016). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Increased state and local government costs for wages, operating expenses, and programs could exceed an estimated \$66 million annually. State and local government income and sales tax revenue could increase by an estimated \$11.1 million annually.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 4-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 31, 2012, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Lara Granich, version 8 (14-017). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Increased state and local government costs for wages, operating expenses, and programs could exceed an estimated \$105 million annually. State and local government income and sales tax revenue could increase by an estimated \$34.6 million annually.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 5-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 31, 2012, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Maureen Dickmann, version 2 (14-018). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State and local governmental entities could have annual lost revenue estimated of at least \$17 million if the proposal results in significant business closures. Changes in economic activity could offset these potential losses by an unknown amount.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 6-2013

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 31, 2012, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 5 (2014-014). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- increase the state minimum wage to \$8.40 per hour, or to the federal minimum wage if that is higher, and adjust the state wage annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index;
- increase the minimum wage for employees who receive tips to 60% of the state minimum wage; and
- modify certain other provisions of the minimum wage law including the retail or service businesses exemption and penalties for paying employees less than the minimum wage?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by

## The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 7-2013

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 31, 2012, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 6 (2014-015). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- increase the state minimum wage to \$8.45 per hour, or to the federal minimum wage if that is higher, and adjust the state wage annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index;
- increase the minimum wage for employees who receive tips to 60% of the state minimum wage; and
- modify certain other provisions of the minimum wage law including the retail or service businesses exemption and penalties for paying employees less than the minimum wage?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by

# The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 8-2013

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

## Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 31, 2012, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 7 (2014-016). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- increase the state minimum wage to \$8.50 per hour, or to the federal minimum wage if that is higher, and adjust the state wage annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index;
- increase the minimum wage for employees who receive tips to 60% of the state minimum wage; and
- modify certain other provisions of the minimum wage law including the retail or service businesses exemption and penalties for paying employees less than the minimum wage?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by

## The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 9-2013

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 31, 2012, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Lara Granich regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 8 (2014-017). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- increase the state minimum wage to \$9.25 per hour, or to the federal minimum wage if that is higher, and adjust the state wage annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index;
- increase the minimum wage for employees who receive tips to 60% of the state minimum wage; and
- modify certain other provisions of the minimum wage law including the retail or service businesses exemption and penalties for paying employees less than the minimum wage?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by

## The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 10-2013

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 31, 2012, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Maureen Dickmann regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (2014-018). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to limit the annual rate of interest, fees, and finance charges for payday, title, installment, and consumer credit loans and prohibit such lenders from using other transactions to avoid the rate limit?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

January 25, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 11-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 17, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Judy Bell (2014-020).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

February 25, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 12-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Herman Kriegshauser, version 2 (2014-022).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

March 8, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 13-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 26, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading, version 2 (2014-023).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 14, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 14-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of March 4, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser, version 2 (14-022). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government revenue may decrease by an estimated \$236 million to \$938 million. Annual state operating costs may increase by at least \$200,000. Reduced state revenue could result in decreased state funding for local governments and public education entities. Public education entities could have an unknown increase in donation revenue.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City

65102

CHRIS KOSTER

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 18, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 15-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

## Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 8, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-022). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to create an individual and corporate state income tax credit of 60% of the amount donated to Missouri not-for-profit elementary and secondary schools or school districts and Missouri not-for-profit foundations providing scholarships for Missouri secondary school graduates to attend Missouri not-for-profit higher education colleges and universities (this credit cannot exceed the donor's state income tax liability for the year)?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 28, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 16-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 18, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Marc Ellinger (2014-024).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 8, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 17-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 28, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery (2014-0025).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 11, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 18-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 1, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading, version 3 (2014-026).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 15, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 19-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of April 5, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (14-024). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Decisions by school districts regarding provisions allowed or required by this proposal and their implementation will influence the potential costs or savings impacting each district. Significant potential costs may be incurred by the state and/or the districts if new/additional evaluation instruments must be developed to satisfy the proposal's performance evaluation requirements.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Page 2

be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General

CIRCUIT CLERKS:
CIRCUIT COURT – CIRCUIT
COURTS:
COURTS:
FEES:
JUDGMENTS:
MUNICIPALITIES:
ORDINANCES:
SHERIFFS' RETIREMENT
SYSTEM:

The exemption for municipal courts from the \$3 surcharge in §57.955, RSMo, was removed in 1996. Therefore, municipal court clerks must collect the surcharge in municipal ordinance violation cases.

OPINION NO. 20-2013

April 17, 2013

The Honorable Brian Munzlinger State Senator, District 18 State Capitol, Room 331-A Jefferson City, MO 65101

## Dear Senator Munzlinger:

You asked whether § 57.955, RSMo,¹ relating to the Sheriffs' Retirement System, requires a municipality to collect a \$3 surcharge for municipal ordinance violations and remit the surcharge to the System. We previously opined in Opinion No. 8-2010 in response to a request from then-Representative Kenny Jones. We are providing this opinion after taking into consideration additional matters raised, reaching the same conclusion on different grounds.² We are withdrawing Opinion No. 8-2010.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All statutory citations are to RSMo Cum. Supp. 2012, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We do not address the constitutionality of collecting this surcharge at all. See Harrison v. Monroe County, 716 S.W.2d 263, 267, 270 (Mo. banc 1986) (Welliver, J., concurring).

Section 57.955, RSMo, provides as follows:

- 1. There shall be assessed and collected a surcharge of three dollars in all civil actions filed in the courts of this state and in all criminal cases including violation of any county ordinance or any violation of criminal or traffic laws of this state, including infractions, but no such surcharge shall be assessed when the costs are waived or are to be paid by the state, county or municipality or when a criminal proceeding or the defendant has been dismissed by the court. For purposes of this section, the term "county ordinance" shall not include any ordinance of the city of St. Louis. The clerk responsible for collecting court costs in civil and criminal cases, shall collect and disburse such amounts as provided by sections 488.010 to 488.020, RSMo. Such funds shall be payable to the sheriffs' retirement fund. Moneys credited to the sheriffs' retirement fund shall be used only for the purposes provided for in sections 57.949 to 57.997 and for no other purpose.
- 2. The board may accept gifts, donations, grants and bequests from public or private sources to the sheriffs' retirement fund.

The historical development of the statute shows that the legislative intent is that the surcharge be collected in municipal cases. The original version of this statute required the collection of the surcharge in all civil cases "filed in each circuit court and the divisions thereof, except the juvenile divisions ...." § 57.960, RSMo Cum. Supp. 1983. Because municipal courts are divisions of the circuit court, Art. V, § 27.2.d, Mo. Const., the fee was required in municipal cases under that statute.

The following year this statute was amended to require the collection of the fee in all civil cases "filed in each circuit court and the divisions thereof, except the municipal and juvenile divisions ... ." § 57.955, RSMo Cum. Supp. 1984. This changed the law so that the municipal court division of the circuit court was exempted from collecting the fee.

The Honorable Brian Munzlinger Page 3

Finally, in 1996, the statute was amended to read as it does today, requiring collection of the fee "in all civil actions filed in the courts of this state ... ." § 57.955, RSMo Cum. Supp. 1996. This change eliminated the exceptions for juvenile divisions and municipal divisions of the circuit courts. For the change to have any meaning, municipal court divisions must now be required to collect the fee. S.S. v. Mitchell, 289 S.W.3d 797, 799 (Mo. App. E.D. 2009) (in interpreting statutes, courts "presume that the legislature intended an amendment to have some effect"). Therefore, the historical development of the statute demonstrates that the legislature intended that the surcharge be collected in municipal court cases.

#### CONCLUSION

The exemption for municipal courts from the \$3 surcharge in §57.955, RSMo, was removed in 1996. Therefore, municipal court clerks must collect the surcharge in municipal ordinance violation cases.

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 22, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 21-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 10, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 2 (2014-027).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



#### Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 22, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 22-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 10, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 22, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 23-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 11, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-024). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- require teachers to be evaluated by a standards based performance evaluation system for which each local school district must receive state approval to continue receiving state and local funding;
- require teachers to be dismissed, retained, demoted, promoted and paid primarily using quantifiable student performance data as part of the evaluation system;
- require teachers to enter into contracts of three years or fewer with public school districts; and

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

> prohibit teachers from organizing or collectively bargaining regarding the design and implementation of the teacher evaluation system?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri

#### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 29, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 24-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of April 19, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading, version 3 (14-026). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal will result in no direct costs or savings for state and local governmental entities. Actions at the local government level allowed by this proposal could result in unknown indirect costs or savings to state and local governmental entities that cannot be estimated.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 2, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 25-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 22, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones (2014-029).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



#### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 3, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 26-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 23, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Jewell Patek, version 2 (2014-030).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



#### Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 6, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 27-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 25, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-0026). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow voters to approve or modify local taxes within their city or county on cigarettes or tobacco products, or on the selling of cigarettes or tobacco products, to be used for local health care, local public education, and local job creation programs?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours



## Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 9, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 28-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of April 29, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 2 (14-027). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State and local governmental entities could have annual lost revenue estimated of at least \$17 million if the proposal results in significant business closures. Potential revenue from fines established by the proposal could offset some of the lost revenue by an unknown amount.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Page 2

be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



# Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 29-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 6, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Todd Jones, version 2 (2014-032).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 30-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 6, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Todd Jones (2014-033).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 17, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 31-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 7, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Clarence L. Stanton (2014-034).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,
CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 17, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 32-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 7, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara (2014-035).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 33-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of May 13, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek, version 2 (14-030). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

No significant estimated costs or savings are expected for state and local governmental entities if this proposal is approved by voters. State governmental entities estimated this proposal could result in increased licensing revenue of at least \$200,000 annually.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City

65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 28, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 34-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 16, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Jewell Patek regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2013-030). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- limit the annual rate of interest, fees, and finance charges for certain loans, and prohibit lenders of such loans from using other transactions to avoid the rate limit; and
- allow the legislature to set a licensing fee of no less than four hundred dollars a year charged to certain lenders for each of their locations?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

OP-2013-0046

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 30, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 35-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 20, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, submitted by Tammy O'Meara, version 3 (2014-036).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

Attorney General



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 7, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 36-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of May 28, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones, version 2 (14-032). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated this proposal will increase state government costs by at least \$118,000 annually and have an unknown change in costs for local governmental entities. Any potential impact to revenues for state and local governmental entities is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 7, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 37-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of May 28, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones (14-033). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The potential costs or savings to state and local governmental entities are unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 38-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 30, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Todd Jones regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-032). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- establish limits on campaign contributions by individuals or entities to political parties, political committees, or committees to elect candidates for state or judicial office;
- prohibit individuals and entities from intentionally concealing the source of such contributions;
- require corporations or labor organizations to meet certain requirements in order to make such contributions; and

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

• provide a complaint process and penalties for any violations of this amendment?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 39-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 30, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Todd Jones regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-033). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- repeal the current prohibition on using state or local government funding for religious purposes;
- repeal the current prohibition on using state or local government funding to aid religious schools, academies, seminaries, colleges, universities, or any other school controlled by a religious organization; and
- repeal the current prohibition on the government granting or donating personal property or real estate for religious purposes?

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 40-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 30, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 3 (2014-037).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

June 10, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 41-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 30, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 4 (2014-0038).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



#### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

June 17, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 42-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 7, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara, version 3 (14-036). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

One-time costs to state governmental entities could be at least \$3,700 with the total potential annual costs being unknown, but probably limited. Local governmental entities expect no potential costs. Possible increased revenue to state and local governmental entities is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 20, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 43-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 10, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for House Joint Resolution Nos. 11 & 7, a constitutional amendment relating to the right to farm (14-HJR 11 & 7). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The potential costs or savings to governmental entities are unknown, but likely limited unless the resolution leads to increased litigation costs and/or the loss of federal funding.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the joint resolution or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 20, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 44-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 10, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for House Joint Resolution No. 16, a constitutional amendment relating to the admissibility of evidence (14-HJR 16). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

If more resources are needed to defend increased prosecutions additional costs to governmental entities could be at least \$1.4 million annually, otherwise the fiscal impact is expected to be limited.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the joint resolution or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



#### Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 21, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 45-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

You have submitted a proposed fair ballot language statement for House Joint Resolution Nos. 11 & 7 relating to the right to farm. The fair ballot language statement, prepared pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, is as follows:

A "yes" vote will amend the Missouri Constitution to guarantee the rights of Missourians to engage in farming and ranching practices, subject to any power given to local government under Article VI of the Missouri Constitution.

A "no" vote will not amend the Missouri Constitution regarding farming and ranching.

If passed, this measure will have no impact on taxes.

Pursuant to §116.025, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed fair ballot language statement.

Because our review of the fair ballot language statement is mandated by statute, no action we take with respect to such review should be construed as an

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

endorsement of the joint resolution, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 21, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 46-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

You have submitted a proposed fair ballot language statement for House Joint Resolution No. 16 relating to the admissibility of evidence. The fair ballot language statement, prepared pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, is as follows:

A "yes" vote will amend the Missouri Constitution to allow evidence of prior criminal acts, whether charged or uncharged, to be considered by courts in prosecutions of sexual crimes that involve a victim under eighteen years of age. The amendment limits the use of such prior acts to support the victim's testimony or show that the person charged is more likely to commit the crime. Further, the judge may exclude such prior acts if the value of considering them is substantially outweighed by the possibility of unfair prejudice to the person charged with committing the crime.

A "no" vote will not amend the Missouri Constitution regarding the use of evidence of prior criminal acts to prosecute sexual crimes.

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

If passed, this measure will have no impact on taxes.

Pursuant to §116.025, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed fair ballot language statement.

Because our review of the fair ballot language statement is mandated by statute, no action we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the joint resolution, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 47-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 3 (2014-036). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri Law be amended to prohibit motorcycle drivers from having a passenger on his or her motorcycle until the driver is 21 years old and require such drivers to successfully complete a motorcycle rider-safety class?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 28, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 48-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 18, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 3 (14-037). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

There are no estimated costs or savings expected for state and local governmental entities if this proposal is approved by voters. Increased fine revenue resulting from this proposal could reduce state government expenses and increase revenue for some school districts, but the fiscal impact is unknown and likely insignificant.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 28, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 49-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 18, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 4 (14-038). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

There are no estimated costs or savings expected for state and local governmental entities if this proposal is approved by voters. Increased fine revenue resulting from this proposal could reduce state government expenses and increase revenue for some school districts, but the fiscal impact is unknown and likely insignificant.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 1, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 50-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 20, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-037). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- limit the annual percentage rate of interest, fees and finance charges at which borrowers can be charged by lenders for certain loans;
- allow borrowers of certain loans, at no cost, to cancel and fully repay the loan within two business days of signing or to enter into an extended payment plan anytime before certain loans are due;
- prohibit criminal prosecution of borrowers for failure to repay certain loans; and

# The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

 create a criminal offense for lenders who purposely and repeatedly violate lending laws contained in this amendment?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 52-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 25, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, submitted by Tammy O'Meara, version 4 (2014-039).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 12, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 53-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 2, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Jewell Patek, version 3 (2014-040).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri

Jefferson City 65102

(573) 751-3321

July 12, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 54-2013

P.O. Box 899

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City. MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 2, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 5 (2014-041).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 12, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 55-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 2, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 6 (2014-042).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

(573) 751-3321

P.O. Box 899

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

July 25, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 56-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of July 15, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara, version 4 (14-039). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

One-time costs to state governmental entities could be at least \$3,700 with the total potential annual costs being unknown, but probably limited. Local governmental entities expect no potential costs. Possible increased revenue to state and local governmental entities is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 26, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 57-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 17, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theo Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City

65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 29, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 58-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 18, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Tammy O'Meara regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 302, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 4 (2014-039). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to prohibit motorcycle drivers from having a passenger on his or her motorcycle until the driver is 21 years old and require such drivers to successfully complete a motorcycle rider-safety class, unless the driver was born in 1984 or earlier and has maintained a motorcycle license for at least the two previous years?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



#### Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 1, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 59-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of July 22, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Jewell Patek, version 3 (14-040). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State and local governmental entities expect no significant costs or savings if this proposal is approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 1, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 60-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of July 22, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 5 (14-041). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State and local governmental entities expect no significant costs or savings if this proposal is approved by voters. Increased fine revenue resulting from this proposal could reduce state government expenses and increase revenue for some school districts, but the fiscal impact is unknown and likely insignificant.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 1, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 61-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of July 22, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery, version 6 (14-042). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State and local governmental entities expect no significant costs or savings if this proposal is approved by voters. Increased fine revenue resulting from this proposal could reduce state government expenses and increase revenue for some school districts, but the fiscal impact is unknown and likely insignificant.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (578) 751-3321

August 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 62-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 25, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Jewell Patek regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 3 (2014-040). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to restrict state law from including a maximum interest rate on loans involving written agreements between borrowers and lenders?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 63-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 25, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (2014-041). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- limit the annual percentage rate of interest, fees and finance charges at which borrowers can be charged by lenders for certain loans;
- allow borrowers of certain loans, at no cost, to cancel and fully repay the loan within two business days of signing or to enter into an extended payment plan anytime before certain loans are due:
- prohibit criminal prosecution of borrowers for failure to repay certain loans; and

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

• create a criminal offense for lenders who purposely and repeatedly violate lending laws contained in this amendment?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City

65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 64-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 25, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Whitfield Montgomery regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (2014-042). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- limit the annual percentage rate of interest, fees and finance charges at which borrowers can be charged by lenders for certain loans;
- allow borrowers of certain loans, at no cost, to cancel and fully repay the loan within two business days of signing or to enter into an extended payment plan anytime before certain loans are due;
- prohibit criminal prosecution of borrowers for failure to repay certain loans; and

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

> create a criminal offense for lenders who purposely and repeatedly violate lending laws contained in this amendment?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTE



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 26, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 65-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 15, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Barbara Swanson (2014-045).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 3, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 66-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 23, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown (2014-046).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 67-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 26, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article V of the Missouri Constitution submitted by John Elliott, version 1 (2014-047).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

ATTORNEY GENERAL

CHRIS KOSTER

September 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 68-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 26, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article V of the Missouri Constitution submitted by John Elliott, version 2 (2014-048).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 6, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 69-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 27, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Brian Leuthauser.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 9, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 70-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of August 30, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Barbara Swanson (14-045). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Any decrease in state revenue will depend on the redemption of tax credits issued related to this proposal, initially limited to \$90 million per year. Increased annual state operating expenses are expected to be initially about \$120,000. Each individual school district will experience an unknown annual change in revenue.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 71-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 6, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Barbara Swanson regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article IX of the Missouri Constitution (2014-045). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- create a tax credit for donations made to nonprofit corporations that provide funds to improve programs in public school districts, provide scholarships for students to attend qualified private or parochial elementary or secondary schools, or support special education services for children;
- limit the tax credit to \$50,000 annually per individual or business entity, and cap the entire credit at \$90 million annually; and

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

 repeal any constitutional provisions that prohibit taxpayer funds from being used to aid private or parochial elementary or secondary schools that qualify for the funding in this measure?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL
65

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 72-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of September 13, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by John Elliott, version 1 (14-047). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State court officials estimate increased annual operating costs starting at \$1.1 million and initial equipment costs and one time building construction and renovation costs of up to \$6.2 million to establish work space for the additional judges and staff. Local governmental entities should experience limited or no increased election related costs.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 73-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of September 13, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by John Elliott, version 2 (14-048). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State court officials estimate increased annual operating costs starting at \$1.1 million and initial equipment costs and one time building construction and renovation costs of up to \$6.2 million to establish work space for the additional judges and staff. Local governmental entities should experience limited or no increased election related costs.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 27, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 74-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 17, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Rodney Gray (2014-050).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 30, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 75-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 19, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by John Elliott regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-047). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- repeal the nonpartisan court plan used to select Missouri Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges;
- require such judges to instead be elected in partisan elections, with political parties nominating party candidates in the primary election prior to the general election;
- allow judges or judicial candidates to solicit, receive and make any legal campaign contributions or expenditures that benefit their own campaigns;

- decrease Supreme Court and Appellate Court judges' terms from 12 years to 8; and
- increase the number of Supreme Court judges from 7 to 9?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 30, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 76-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 19, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by John Elliott regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article V of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-048). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- repeal the nonpartisan court plan used to select Missouri Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges;
- require such judges to instead be elected in partisan elections, with political parties nominating party candidates in the primary election prior to the general election;
- allow judges or judicial candidates to solicit, receive and make any legal campaign contributions or expenditures that benefit their own campaigns;

### The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

- decrease Supreme Court and Appellate Court judges' terms from 12 years to 8; and
- increase the number of Supreme Court judges from 7 to 9?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 7, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 77-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 26, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 172, 174, 175, and 178, Revised Statutes of Missouri, submitted by Brad Ketcher, version 2 (2014-051).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 21, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 79-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 10, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Rodney Gray, version 2 (2014-052).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 25, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 80-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of October 15, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher, version 2 (14-051). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State and local governmental entities expect no costs or savings to result from this proposal.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 28, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 81-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 17, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher regarding a proposed amendment to amend Chapters 172, 174, 175, and 178, Revised Statutes of Missouri, version 2 (2014-051). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to require the governing boards of state universities and colleges to include a nonpartisan student member who may vote on tuition, fees, and any other board issues?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 4, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 82-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 24, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition (2014-053).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 7, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 83-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 28, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Brad Ketcher (2014-054).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 12, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 84-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of October 30, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Rodney Gray, version 2 (14-052). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual increased revenue is estimated to start at \$651 million for the state and \$72 million for local governments. Expenditure of this revenue is restricted to the purposes outlined in the proposal.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri

### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 12, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 85-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 31, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Rodney Gray regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-052). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- increase funding for state, county, and municipal street, road, bridge, highway, and public transportation initiatives by increasing state sales/use tax by 1 %;
- prohibit a change in gasoline taxes and prohibit toll roads or bridges; and
- require these measures to be re-approved by voters every 10 years?

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 14, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 86-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 4, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Bradley Ketcher, version 2 (2014-055).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri

### Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 18, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 87-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 8, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 1 (2014-056).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 18, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 88-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 8, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 2 (2014-057).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 18, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 89-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 8, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 3 (2014-058).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

**CHRIS KOSTER** 



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 22, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 90-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Aaron Willard, version 1 (2014-059).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 22, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 91-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Aaron Willard, version 2 (2014-060).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 27, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 92-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 18, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Aaron Willard (2014-061).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 27, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 93-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of November 18, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Brad Ketcher (14-054). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State governmental entities estimate increased annual operating costs starting at about \$67,000. Local governmental entities estimate no impact to operating costs. Any potential impact to state and local governmental revenues is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



### Attorney General of Missouri

### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 27, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 94-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 18, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed (2014-062).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 27, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 95-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 18, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Steven Reed (2014-063).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri Jefferson City

65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 27, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 96-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 18, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed (2014-064).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KÖSTER Attorney General



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 97-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 20, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 4 (2014-065).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 98-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 20, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 5 (2014-066).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



### Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 99-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 20, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 6 (2014-067).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### Attorney General of Missouri

### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 100-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Brad Ketcher regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (2014-054). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- establish limits on campaign contributions that candidates for state legislature can accept from individuals or entities:
- establish a limit on gifts that state legislators, and their employees, can accept from lobbyists;
- prohibit state legislators, and their employees, from serving as paid lobbyists for a period of time or being paid for campaign work;
- prohibit political fundraising on general assembly property;

- require legislative records to be open to the public; and
- prohibit any law that disqualifies the counting of valid signatures on petitions based on how voters sign the petition?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 5, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 101-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of November 25, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Bradley Ketcher, version 2 (14-055). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State governmental entities estimate increased annual operating costs starting at about \$67,000. Local governmental entities estimate no impact to operating costs. Any potential impact to state and local governmental revenues is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



### Attorney General of Missouri

### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 6, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 102-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of November 26, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard, version 1 (14-059). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The potential costs or savings to state and local governmental entities is unknown. Legislative, administrative and potential legal decisions made will impact the dollar amount of tax credits issued, authorized or approved and what if any reduction will occur in the individual income tax rate(s).

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

### JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 6, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 103-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of November 26, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard, version 2 (14-060). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The potential costs or savings to state and local governmental entities is unknown. Legislative, administrative and potential legal decisions made will impact the dollar amount of tax credits issued, authorized or approved and what if any reduction will occur in the individual income tax rate(s).

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 6, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 104-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 27, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Brad Ketcher regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-055). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- establish limits on campaign contributions that candidates for state legislature can accept from individuals or entities:
- establish a limit on gifts that state legislators, and their employees, can accept from lobbyists;
- prohibit state legislators, and their employees, from serving as paid lobbyists for a period of time or being paid for campaign work;
- prohibit political fundraising on general assembly property;

- require legislative records to be open to the public; and
- prohibit any law that disqualifies the counting of valid signatures on petitions based on how voters sign the petition?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 105-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

## Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 5, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Aaron Willard regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 1 (2014-059). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- limit the total amount of tax credits state government may issue, authorize, or approve to \$200 million a year;
- reduce the individual income tax rate after any year in which state government issues, authorizes, or approves more than \$200 million in tax credits;
- eliminate the individual income tax if it is reduced to one quarter of one percent or less as a result of this measure; and

• prohibit the general assembly from imposing an individual income tax if it is eliminated as a result of this measure?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 106-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

## Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 5, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Aaron Willard regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, version 2 (2014-060). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- prohibit state government from providing tax credits above the current amount issued, authorized, or approved by the state;
- reduce the individual income tax rate after any year in which tax credits are issued, authorized, or approved above the limit put into place by this measure;
- eliminate the individual income tax if it is reduced to one quarter of one percent or less as a result of this measure; and

# The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

 prohibit the general assembly from imposing an individual income tax if it is eliminated as a result of this measure?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 107-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 6, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Aaron Willard (2014-078).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 108-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 6, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Aaron Willard (14-061). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State government entities estimate this proposal could reduce total state revenue by \$1.5 billion in the first full effective fiscal year. If a decrease occurs, the legislature is authorized but not required to make changes to the state sales tax to offset lost revenue and renew changes each year thereafter.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 16, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 109-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 6, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Steven Reed (14-063). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposed constitutional amendment will impose a sales tax of one-tenth of one percent for one year. The additional revenues of approximately \$73 million will be used for the promotion and development of Technology Parks in southwest Missouri. State governmental entities will have one-time increased operating costs of about \$139,000.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 110-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 4 (14-065). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State government would have unknown costs and local governments could have total startup costs of up to \$2.5 million and total on-going costs ranging from \$770,000 to \$9.5 million for each election cycle depending on election authority compensation, staffing, and planning decisions.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 111-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 5 (14-066). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State government would have unknown costs and local governments could have total startup costs of up to \$2.5 million and total on-going costs ranging from \$834,000 to \$9.9 million for each election cycle depending on election authority compensation, staffing, and planning decisions.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 112-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matthew Dameron, version 6 (14-067). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State government would have unknown costs and local governments could have total startup costs of up to \$2 million and total on-going costs ranging from \$705,000 to \$7.5 million for each election cycle depending on election authority compensation, staffing, and planning decisions.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 113-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 11, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Brad Ketcher, version 3 (2014-079).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 114-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Aaron Willard regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (2014-061). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

#### Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- create a new state income tax structure for taxable income above or below \$30,000 for married individuals filing joint returns (and heads of households), and taxable income above or below \$15,000 for other individuals;
- allow the general assembly to increase the sales tax and/or tax base to make up for any loss of state revenue if a decrease in income tax decreases state revenue; and

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

 eliminate state and local income or earnings taxes (other than those created by cities before January 1, 2013) and prohibit any new income or earnings taxes?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 115-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Steven Reed regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (2014-063). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to establish a one-tenth of one percent state sales/use tax for one year to be used for technology initiatives in southwest Missouri with the purpose of providing funding for new companies, jobs, and research and development?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 116-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matthew Dameron regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 4 (2014-065). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to provide all voters a period of six weeks prior to election day to cast a ballot in all federal and state general elections at either a central voting location or, depending on the number of registered voters in the jurisdiction, a satellite voting site?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

K. Carl

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 117-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matthew Dameron regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 5 (2014-066). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to provide all voters a period of six weeks prior to election day to cast a ballot in all federal and state general elections at either a central voting location or, depending on the number of registered voters in the jurisdiction, a satellite voting site?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 118-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 12, 2013, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matthew Dameron regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 6 (2014-067). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to provide all voters a period of six weeks prior to election day to cast a ballot in all federal and state general elections at either a central voting location or, depending on the number of registered voters in the jurisdiction, a satellite voting site?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 119-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 11 (2014-080).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

(573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 120-2013

P.O. Box 899

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 12 (2014-081).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 121-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 13 (2014-082).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 122-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 14 (2014-083).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 123-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 15 (2014-084).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 124-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 16 (2014-085).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 125-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 17 (2014-086).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 126-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 18 (2014-087).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 127-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 19 (2014-088).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

(573) 751-3321

P.O. Box 899

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 128-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 20 (2014-089).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 129-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 21 (2014-090).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 130-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 22 (2014-091).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 131-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article I of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets, version 23 (2014-092).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 132-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets, version 24 (2014-093).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 133-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets, version 25 (2014-094).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



# Attorney General of Missouri

## JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 23, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 134-2013

The Honorable Jason Kander Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Kander:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 13, 2013, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets, version 26 (2014-095).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to

The Honorable Jason Kander Page 2

review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



## Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 30, 2013

OPINION LETTER NO. 135-2013

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 20, 2013, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Todd Jones (14-032). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated this proposal will increase state government costs by at least \$118,000 annually and have an unknown change in costs for local governmental entities. Any potential impact to revenues for state and local governmental entities is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER